31st October 1935]

Public Works

Representation from the Municipal Council, Vellore, regarding the opening of a wicket gate on the southern side of the Fort.

* 363 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government or the Board of Revenue received any representation from the Municipality of Vellore regarding the opening of a wicket gate on the southern side of the Fort;

(*b*) if so, what action has been taken by the Government;

(*c*) from what time this wicket gate was open and when it was closed and why; and

(*d*) whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table of this House the correspondence between the district officials and the Government, and the grounds on which such action was taken?

A.—(*a*) The Board of Revenue received a representation in May 1935.

(*b*) The Board agreed with the Collector that no inconvenience was caused to the public by the closure of the entrance. The matter did not come up to Government.

(*c*) & (*d*) There is no information to show from what time the gate was open. It was closed in 1931. The Collector's letter, dated the 5th June 1935, explaining the circumstances in which the gate was closed is placed on the table.[a]

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar:—"The main objection for opening the wicket gate is that loafers are loitering in the place and so on. May I know from the Hon. Minister whether that could not be prevented by posting a constable on duty at the place?" 11-30 a.m.

The Hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"The easier of the two alternatives was the closing of the gate."

Electrification of the District and the Sub-Court premises of Salem.

* 364 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) why the buildings of the Judicial Department in Salem, especially the premises of the District and the Sub-Judge's Courts are not provided with electric lights and fans when the town has been electrified long ago; and

(*b*) when they are likely to be electrified, and what will be the approximate cost of the scheme?

A.—In July 1934, the Government approved an expenditure of Rs. 6,970 on the electrification of the following buildings:—

District Court-house buildings, Salem.
Principal District Munsif's Court at Salem.
District Munsif's Court, Sankari at Salem.

The work will be carried out when funds become available.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IX on pages 329-330 infra.

[31st October 1935

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder:—" In the answer it is stated that the work will be carried out when funds become available. May I ask the Hon. Minister whether the work will be taken up in the coming year and whether any provision has been made in the budget for the coming year in this behalf?"

The Hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I am sorry I cannot answer the question off-hand."

Mr. M. S. Sreshta:—" Is it not the policy of the Government to electrify public buildings wherever electricity is available?"

The Hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Wherever electricity is available and whenever funds are available, certainly it has been the policy of the Government to electrify public buildings."

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder:—" May I know, Sir, why this building alone has been left out while all other Government offices in Salem have been electrified?"

The Hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Probably plans and estimates were not ready at the time."

Education

Latest date prescribed this year for the receipt of applications for admission into the Queen Mary's College, Madras.

* 365 *Q.*—Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) what was the date fixed for sending applications for admission into the Queen Mary's College this year;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the applicants have to give in their application forms the marks obtained by them in the S.S.L.C. examination;

(*c*) what was the date on which the S.S.L.C. registers were given to the students by the headmasters of high schools; and

(*d*) how many applications were rejected this year for the reason that the applications were received after the due date and to what districts the rejected candidates belong?

A.—(*a*) June 15th, subsequently changed to June 25th.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The Government have no information.

(*d*) Seven, the number being distributed as follows:—

Malabar	1
Guntur	1
Kistna	1
Tanjore	1
Madras	1
Nellore	1
North Arcot	1
	7